



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,368	01/30/2002	Christopher Jean Seiler	6647-29	4539

45842 7590 04/13/2007  
MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C. - NOVELL  
210 SW MORRISON STREET  
SUITE 400  
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER
----------

SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/13/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/066,368	SEILER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Thomas E. Shortledge	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-10, 13-19, 22-28, 31, 32 and 34-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-10, 13-19, 22-28, 31-32 and 34-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is in response to Remarks, filed 04/04/07.
2. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 13-19, 22-28, 31-32 and 34-38 are pending.

***Response to Amendment***

3. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.
4. The Declaration filed on 04/04/07 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the Yu (2004/0205118) reference.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2626

6. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 13-19, 22-28, 31-32 and 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fogarty in view of (6,311,180) in view of Byers et al. (US 6,975,619 B1)

As to claim 1, Fogarty teaches:

a computer (a target device such as a cell phone, col. 5 line 10);

a directory entry for the user, the directory entry stored in the computer and including identity information for the user (user profile input stored on the target device, col. 6, lines 1-9);

means for determining browser information for a browser stored on the second computer (a browser, and selecting a language based on the display localization process, where based on the display, special fonts, display characteristics and text strings are used to determine which and how to display a language, col. 6, lines 45-62);

a ranker for ranking a plurality of languages based on at least the directory entry, the location information, and the browser information and a selector for selecting one of the plurality of languages with a highest rank (based on a user profile and locations and display information, languages are ranked, and the highest ranking language is selected, col. 7, line 55 through col. 8, line 8).

Fogarty teaches location information (col. 7, lines 60-64), however, Fogarty does not teach a first and second computer nor location information for a location from which the first computer can be accessed.

However, Byers et al. teaches a computer network system with a first and second computer, and geographic information indicating the location of the user, from the user's Internet Protocol (IP) address (Fig. 1, elements 12, 14, 22, 24 and 20 and col. 4, lines 35-40)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Fogarty with the location identification methods of Byers et al. to allow the correct data packets to be sent to correct user based on geographic location information, (col. 1, lines 20-30)

As to claim 2, Fogarty teaches the identify information includes the language (the user profile includes language information, col. 6, lines 1-10).

As to claim 3, Fogarty teaches a container hierarchy including at least a first container (storing languages the user is able to understand, col. 7, lines 55-60), the first container including a second container (storing location for the user each location having specific language information, col. 7, line 60 through col. 8, line 4), the second container including the directory entry (directory entries for each user that is located in Texas, col. 7, lines 60-67); and the second container including a default language (the default language for Texas being English, col. 7, lines 60-67).

Art Unit: 2626

As to claim 4, Fogarty teaches the directory entry can inherit the default language from the second container (the default language, English, can be applied to users located in Texas, col. 7, line 60, through col. 8, line 4).

As to claims 6, 15 and 24, Fogarty teaches  
a computer-readable modulated carrier signal (connecting the user to the internet, col. 4, lines 55-58);

logging the user into a first computer from a second computer with login information, using the login information to identify a directory entry for the user (login the user into the Internet through a first computer (col. 4, lines 35-40) storing numerous user profiles on display device, (col. 4, lines 55-58), where it would be necessary for a user to login to a device for a specific profile to be selected);

determining a first language from the directory entry from the user; determining a second language based on a location of the user (determining a first and second language that a user can understand, col. 7, lines 51-59);

determining a third language from a browser (a browser, and selecting a language based on the display localization process, where based on the display, special fonts, display characteristics and text strings are used to determine which and how to display a language, col. 6, lines 45-62);

ranking the first, second and third languages; and selecting a highest ranked language as the preferred language (a prioritization process for ranking the languages

Art Unit: 2626

in the user profile and the display localization language, then selecting the highest ranking language, col. 7, line 59 through col. 8, line 8).

Fogarty does not teach a location of the user at the second computer.

However, Byers et al. teaches a computer network system with a first and second computer, and geographic information indicating the location of the user, from the user's Internet Protocol (IP) address (Fig. 1, elements 12, 14, 22, 24 and 20 and col. 4, lines 35-40)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Fogarty with the location identification methods of Byers et al. to allow the correct data packets to be sent to correct user based on geographic location information, (col. 1, lines 20-30)

As to claims 7, 16 and 25, Fogarty teaches determining the first language includes determining the language from an identity information stored in the directory entry for the user (determining a language from the personal information of the user, col. 7, line 61, through col. 8, line 5).

As to claims 8, 17 and 26, Fogarty teaches accessing the directory entry for the user from the first computer (accessing the user profile stored in the directory, col. 4, lines 55-58); and locating the identity information in the directory entry (locating the user location information within the user profile, col. 7, lines 55 through col. 8, line 5).

As to claims 9, 18 and 27, Fogarty teaches determining the first language includes determining that no language is specified in the identity information in the directory entry, and the method further comprises inheriting the first language from a container of the directory entry (users who do not indicate a language, a locale specific prioritization process compares the languages used for the text portion with the languages used in the locale where the user lives, and selects a corresponding language, col. 7, line 61 through col. 8, line 4).

As to claim 10, 19, and 28, Fogarty teaches identifying a default language (col. 7, lines 60-67); however, Fogarty does not teach determining the second language includes determining the location of the user at the second computer.

However, Byers et al. teaches a computer network system with a first and second computer, and geographic information indicating the location of the user, from the user's Internet Protocol (IP) address (Fig. 1, elements 12, 14, 22, 24 and 20 and col. 4, lines 35-40)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Fogarty with the location identification methods of Byers et al. to allow the correct data packets to be sent to correct user based on geographic location information, (col. 1, lines 20-30)



Art Unit: 2626

As to claims 13, 22 and 31, Fogarty teaches using the preferred language to display the content to the user (outputting the document in a language the user can understand, col. 6, lines 5-10).

As to claims 14, 23 and 32, Fogarty teaches using the preferred language includes sending the preferred language in a packet header from the first computer to a content provider (fig. 1, shows communicating between a database, a app. server communicating with a web server, where language information can be sent from the database to the web server to properly display a page, where it would be necessary that an internet connection is used, a packet header would be used to send information to the content provider).

As to claim 34, Fogarty teaches the identity information further includes a second language (natural languages that user can read are listed, col. 6, lines 1-8, where it would be necessary that since the languages is plural a second language would be present).

As to claims 35, 36 and 37, Fogarty teaches determining a first language from the directory entry for the user includes determining the first language and a third language from the directory entry for the user (determining a first, second and third language from the profile of the user saved in the database, col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 8).

As to claim 38, Fogarty teaches the first container includes a second default language, and the directory entry can inherit the second default language from the first container (in view of the rejection of claim 3, Fogarty also teaches a second default language for different locations, col. 8, lines 1-8).

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is (571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TS  
4/11/07



RICHEMOND DORVIL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER